TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC MEETING

Taken On
March 30, 2005

Transcript provided by:

HUTCHINGS[SM]
COURT REPORTERS, LLC
CSR 649

GLOBAL LEGAL SERVICES

800.697.3210

CERTIFIED COPY

PUBLIC MEETING
FOR PROPOSED PROJECT DISPOSITION
(FULL OR PARTIAL REMOVAL) OF SONGS UNIT 1
OFFSHORE INTAKE AND DISCHARGE CONDUITS

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2005, 4:02 P.M and 6:15 P.M.
100 NORTH CALLE SEVILLE
SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA

Reported by:
Gail E. Kennamer, CSR 4583
Hutchings Number 92972-OC

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

For STATE OF CALIFORNIA:
STATE LANDS COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT
BY ERIC L. GILLIES
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, California 95825-8202

For EDAW INC.:
BY THOMAS M. LARKIN
1420 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 620
San Diego, California 92101

ALSO PRESENT AT THE 4:00 P.M. HEARING:
Richard Bell
Robert Bledsoc
F. Cesar Lopez, Jr.
Dave Brevig
Craig Eaker
Kathleen Yhip
Susan Herman

ALSO PRESENT AT THE 6:00 P.M. HEARING:
David Kay
Larry Rannals
Ben Kewler
Craig Eaker

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA - WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2005,
4:02 P.M.

MR. GILLIES: Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks for coming.

My name is Eric Gillies, and I'm with the State Lands Commission. I'm a project manager on this project.

This is the Disposition of the Offshore Cooling Water Conduits of the SONGS Unit 1 Draft Environmental Impact.

The purpose of this meeting is to go over the document. And if you have any comments, feel free to come up. We will have a presentation after this introduction by the California State Lands, the State's lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act.

We were approached by Southern California Edison who is the current applicant who provided an application for this project. We contracted with EDAW environmental consultants to prepare the Draft Environmental Impact Report, and they are going to have a presentation on the project, the environmental impact assessment and a brief project overview.

Following the presentation we'll have oral

testimony coming from the public. If you haven't already, there are sign-up sheets in the back to fill out. We have received two requests to speak. So following presentation we'll ask you to come up in the order we received them.

With that, I'll go ahead and turn it over to Tom Larkin with EDAW to present the project.

MR. LARKIN: Good afternoon.

I'll start with the brief introduction of the project. It's located in the northern coastal portion of Camp Pendleton at the San Onofre Nuclear Power Plant Unit Number 1.

And the area that we'll be discussing is the offshore lease area for the intake and discharge conduits. You can see that is shown. There are two separate conduits that extend out into the ocean. The intake conduit is 3,200 feet, and the discharge conduit is 2,600 feet in length. They were used to supply cooling water to the cooling plant when it was in operation, and they are reinforced concrete pipes, 12 feet in diameter, reinforced pipe buried beneath the seabed at least 4 feet. As they get closer to shore, they are as much as 20 to 25 feet beneath the seabed. There are terminal structures, concrete structures, at the end of conduits. They extend 16 feet above the

seabed.

Then there are manholes and manhole risers that would be 500 feet along the conduits. So there are a total of nine manhole risers.

This is a photo of the site while it's being decommissioned. This is a photo from Edison.

Both in the draft EIR and in this presentation, there are a number of graphics and photos that were provided by Edison in their work plan and in their previous Power Point. You can see the cranes currently using the decommissioning of the Unit 1 power plant. And in this photo the conduits extend under the beach and out into the ocean directly towards us in this view.

The decommissioning, as I said, is already underway. That is not a part of this project. This project only evaluates the lease for the offshore conduits. Edison commissioned engineering studies to look at alternatives. There were nine alternatives that were evaluated.

What was agreed upon as a proposed project between Edison and State Lands was a partial removal of the project. That would be the removal of the terminal structures and the manhole risers and plugging the conduits under the beach, but would leave the major portions of the conduits intact beneath the sea floor.

And the reason for selecting this alternative is obviously that it would greatly reduce the potential environmental effects when compared to the complete removal alternative.

There are a number of features that have been incorporated into the work plan for the project that would mitigate impacts and provide safety: The Marine Safety Plan, Diver Safety Plan, obviously from OSHA from a worker-safety standpoint, but the Oil Spill Response Plan, the Debris Removal Plan, and Anchoring Plan have been designed to minimize environmental effects.

This shows the intake structure at the end of the intake conduit. It's a very large concrete structure. This is a cross-section that shows that it extends below the sea floor for quite a distance approximately 20 feet and 16 feet above the sea floor bed with a cap. And the bottom portion of this graphic shows what the end result of the project would be to remove the top three rings of the terminal structure so that the remaining portion would be flush with the seabed surrounded by a rock riprap bed, and that there would be a marine mammal barrier, an iron grate that would be placed over the opening in the terminal structure to prevent divers or marine mammals from getting into the conduit. This would be the proposed action for both of the conduits,

intake and discharge, and gradually over time, sand from wave action would begin to fill in the terminal structures.

This is a cross-section showing the conduit with the manhole and the manhole riser that extends above the sea floor bed anywhere from 2 to 5 feet. There is nine of these structures, and the bottom portion shows the removal of the manhole riser that would be drudging to remove the sand cover, and then to come down and remove the terminal structure -- excuse me -- the manhole riser and then there would be a smaller manhole grate put over the opening of the conduit, and this would gradually fill in with sand due to wave action over time.

The project would be accomplished by the use of a large crane barge which would be towed from the Port of Long Beach, and this is a typical picture of a typical crane barge. They would use a clamshell bucket to remove the sand from above the conduits and then there would be a diamond cutting machine that would be used to cut the concrete.

The crane would then remove the concrete pieces, place them on the sea floor adjacent to the terminal structures and adjacent to the manhole risers. Then when the project was complete, the concrete pieces would be picked up, put on the deck, and then taken back by

tugboat to Long Beach for recycling and disposal.
So this would be used in the offshore areas. It's a very large structure and cannot get into close in-shore areas, so a smaller vehicle called a Surf Sled vehicle would be used. This would be placed over each of the manhole risers in the nearshore environment. Divers would then get inside the structure and remove the manhole riser, and then the Surf Sled vehicle would be moved from manhole to manhole. And this shows the only portion of the beach that would be disturbed by this alternative or the proposed project.
The Beach Winch would be placed as shown in the center of this diagram, and then there would be a hoist or cable extending out to the offshore crane barge, and then the Surf Sled vehicle would be moved along that cable from manhole to manhole while it removed the manhole risers.
And then the final portion of the project is the Conduit Plug. You can see the concrete truck in the upper right. It would come through the plant. It would not have to go through the beach at all. It would come through the existing Unit 1 plant. Concrete would be pumped into these fabric forms. This shows just one of them.
But as each one is filled, eventually the entire

conduit would be plugged with this concrete grout. Divers would be used to help put this in place and make sure everything functioned well. And this is not a part of the State Lands lease. This is a part of the operation that is under lease from the U.S. Marine Corps, but it's part of the overall projects. It's been evaluated even if it's not part of State Lands approval process.
So this is a brief overview of the EIR process to date.
We've completed many steps so far. The July 1st was a Scoping Meeting. It was in this room where we discussed the project and the environmental effects. And the interesting concept there was both the San Diego County Water Authority and the Municipal Water District of Orange County expressed an interest in potential future reuse of the conduits for intake and discharge for a future regional desalination plant. That is not a specific project that has been proposed, so it's not evaluated as a cumulative project in the EIR. There is discussion of which of the alternatives would be suitable for future use for a desalination plant at Camp Pendleton.
So the public review period started in February for this Draft Environmental Impact Report. The 45-day

period expires next weekend, next week, April 8. There is the public hearing this afternoon at 6:00 o'clock this evening to receive oral comments based on the written and oral comments. We will prepare responses and then prepare a final EIR revised draft as necessary. And the intent is to get this project to State Lands for a public hearing on the final EIR and disposition of the project itself, a decision on which of the alternatives and mitigations to adopt. Once State Lands has acted on the project, a Notice of Determination will be filed.
So the draft EIR addressed 11 environmental issues. We'll go through some of the key issues briefly.
The State Lands has a formal process of classification of impacts:
Class I is significant, not mitigable.
Class II are potentially significant impacts; can be mitigable.
Class III are adverse impacts that are not significant.
Class IV are beneficial impact.
The first issue that we'll address is marine water quality. This is an aerial view of the site and what is shown in each of these locations are the different locations. There is four -- actually, 1, 2, 3, 4 locations where the crane barge will be anchored after

removal of the terminal structures and the offshore manhole risers.
You can see like for this, this is the anchor location, there will be four anchors for each time that the crane barge is placed for removal of the structures.
So the Environmental Impact Report evaluated the impacts of the anchoring plan as well as the dredging that is required to remove the structures.
The primary issue is Turbidity Impacts During the Dredging operation to expose the terminal structures and the manhole risers. And so the EIR identified four mitigation measures that would be appropriate to mitigate the effect of dredging, both the dredging and the anchoring plan. So these are specific measures that have been identified. If they are implemented, it would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level after mitigation was implemented.
The Marine Biological Resources was a major issue we addressed. This map shows the bottom habitat in the area. The sandy color represents the sand area, and you can see that in the alignment, most of the -- in the lease area, most of the area is sand, and that is the natural condition. As well as from the original construction of the project, as that area was dredged

out and the conduits were placed, that sand was backfilled so that it's mostly a sand area that is potentially impacted. There are a few rocky areas as well as rock riprap around the terminal structures.

This map shows the distribution of kelp. There are three alignments here shown. This is Unit 1 and then these are Units 2 and 3, the intake and discharge. So we're only concerned with the northern Unit 1 discharge and intake structures. And you can see that the kelp distribution is not in the immediate vicinity of the Unit 1 intake and discharge conduits.

So the concern with regard to March Biological Resources was potential impacts to essential fish habitat, whether it be disturbance of surfgrass or kelp forests. Whether there would be indirect effects from sedimentation beyond the project footprint, and to be determined there would be no adverse effects on sensitive species since there are no rare, endangered, or threatened species in the project vicinity.

We determined the four water quality mitigation measures that I mentioned previously would be adequate to mitigate the biological effects; and so it was determined that the potentially significant marine biological impacts would be fully mitigated with the implementation of those measures.

The next issue we addressed was Commercial Fisheries. The California Department of Fish and Game maintains catch data on commercial fisheries for blocks offshore of the California coast. That fish block 756 is the one that is affected or is the one that within which would be located. You can see the lease area is a relatively small portion of that. Nevertheless, we did want to analyze the effect on commercial fishery. The primary concern was with regard to lobster. There are lobster traps that are set in the vicinity of the terminal structures and in the rock riprap area there. So what we did was we determined there was a potential effect, and that the measure that would mitigate that effect would be to conclude project construction during the lobster fishing season. And that seems to be very feasible. The lobster fishing begins in early October, first week of October, and the project is proposed to be implemented during the summer when there would be less adverse effect from storm surge or other weather that would affect the disposition activities of the proposed project. So with that mitigation, there would be no significant loss of commercial species or their habitat.

Related issue is Environmental Justice. We talked about there is no effect on the habitat of the fisheries. We also wanted to see if there is any effect

on the commercial viability of the fishermen themselves as well as determine if there is any effect on minority or low income populations from private implementation. And the EIR concluded there would be no adverse effects; that because of the very short project duration of approximately three months, the fact that it's a very small area within that fish block and that we could avoid the fishing season, that there would not be a significant environmental injustice effect.

With regard to recreation, this map shows the locations of beaches. Here is our project, and immediately to the north approximately a quarter mile is Surf Beach which is one of the three beaches at San Onofre State Park. The project would not require any activities going through Surf Beach. All of the disposition activities would be from offshore. The only onshore activity replacing that beach is shown in one of the graphics. And so the conclusion was that there would not be any adverse effect on recreation.

There was one measure that was identified that there is a Coast Guard notice to local mariners that is published every month, so we would notify the Coast Guard so they could let recreational boaters know there would be an offshore activity, but that it would not be an adverse effect on boaters.

So just to summarize, there were five areas that had potentially significant effects that we identified in the EIR. We found all of them could be adequately mitigated with the measures identified in the draft EIR.

The other six issues were found to be not significant; that mitigation measures would not be required for these six areas, although they are fairly addressed in the draft EIR.

I would like to talk now about the alternatives in the draft EIR, and I'll go through them one by one.

The complete removal alternative was addressed and if it would have greater impacts because a strict interpretation of the lease by the commissioners of the State and Lands Commission may require complete removal.

So in order to implement that, all the traffic for the initial area would have to come off the freeway, old Highway 101 through Surf Beach. You can see the red arrows there along the beach to a substantial work area south of Surf Beach, and sheet piles and a trestle would have to be extended approximately 400 feet off the beach to work in the nearshore environment.

And Edison provided these historic photos showing the construction of the project in the 1960s, so you can see the trestle that would be constructed offshore of San Onofre, and then this is a view from the shore